


EXHIBIT A

Caridis, Alyssa


From: Lindsay Cooper <lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 7:36 AM
To: Caridis, Alyssa; de Blank, Bas; Roberts, Clement; Dan Smith ; mark@waltfairpllc.com; Rory Shea; Sean Sullivan; Johnson, Jeffrey; pamstutz@scottdoug.com; Matt Sampson; Verhoeven, Charles; Melissa Baily
Subject: Re: Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC (6:20-cv-00881-ADA)

Alyssa,

According to the below, the Court intends to “review the motion to dismiss and the motion to transfer together.” Given that, our understanding is that Sonos should be filing a response to our 12(b)(3) motion today.

In the CRSR, Google did not say that it “intended” to withdraw its 12(b)(3) motion; it said it was willing to withdraw its 12(b)(3) motion to the extent Sonos was willing to negotiate a reasonable timeframe within which to answer Sonos’s complaint. Sonos did not take Google up on that offer at the time.


Lindsay

From: Caridis, Alyssa <acaridis@orrick.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 6:29:06 PM
To: de Blank, Bas <basdeblank@orrick.com>; Roberts, Clement <croberts@orrick.com>; Dan Smith  <smith@ls3ip.com>; mark@waltfairpllc.com <mark@waltfairpllc.com>; Rory Shea <shea@ls3ip.com>; Sean Sullivan <sullivan@ls3ip.com>; Johnson, Jeffrey <jj@orrick.com>; Verhoeven, Charles <charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com>; lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com <lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com>; melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com <melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com>; pamstutz@scottdoug.com <pamstutz@scottdoug.com>; Matt Sampson <sampson@ls3ip.com>
Subject: RE: Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC (6:20-cv-00881-ADA)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sorry there’s a typo below. The second sentence should read that Sonos’s opposition to Google’s upcoming 1404(a) motion will be due two weeks after the completion of venue discovery. (Per the OGP, Google’s venue motion itself is due two weeks after the CMC.)

Alyssa

From: Caridis, Alyssa
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 6:25 PM
To: de Blank, Bas <basdeblank@orrick.com>; Roberts, Clement <croberts@orrick.com>; Dan Smith  <smith@ls3ip.com>; mark@waltfairpllc.com; Rory Shea <shea@ls3ip.com>; Sean Sullivan <sullivan@ls3ip.com>; Johnson, Jeffrey <jj@orrick.com>; Verhoeven, Charles <charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com>; lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com; melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com; pamstutz@scottdoug.com; Matt Sampson <sampson@ls3ip.com>
Subject: RE: Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC (6:20-cv-00881-ADA)

Lindsay –

In light of the below, it is our understanding that no opposition brief is due tomorrow. The deadline to Google's upcoming 1404(a) motion will be due two weeks after the completion of venue discovery. Obviously Sonos opposes Google's Motion to Dismiss, but Google has already expressed its intent to withdraw that motion. If you have a different understanding, intend to pursue the pending motion to dismiss, or otherwise believe that an opposition to that motion is due tomorrow, please let us know immediately.

Alyssa

From: Joshua Yi <Joshua_Yi@txwd.uscourts.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 4:55 PM

To: Caridis, Alyssa <acaridis@orrick.com>; de Blank, Bas <basdeblank@orrick.com>; Roberts, Clement <croberts@orrick.com>; Dan Smith <smith@ls3ip.com>; mark@waltfairpllc.com; Rory Shea <shea@ls3ip.com>; Sean Sullivan <sullivan@ls3ip.com>; Johnson, Jeffrey <jj@orrick.com>; Verhoeven, Charles <charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com>; lindsaycooper@quinnemanuel.com; melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com; pamstutz@scottdoug.com

Cc: Hannah Santasawatkul <Hannah_Santasawatkul@txwd.uscourts.gov>

Subject: Sonos, Inc. v. Google LLC (6:20-cv-00881-ADA)

Counsel,

The Court has reviewed the parties' CRSR and decided to allow Google to file a separate 1404 motion. Once ripe, the Court will review the motion to dismiss and the motion to transfer together.

In case the parties weren't aware, the Court recently entered a standing order lifting the limits on venue and jurisdictional discovery, with Plaintiff's response to a motion to transfer due two weeks after the completion of venue discovery. To the extent the parties need the Court's assistance to help determine the scope and deadline for discovery, please contact the Court to request a telephonic hearing.

As this appears to be the only remaining pre-Markman issue, the Court will deem that the CMC was held. To the extent the parties have additional pre-Markman issues, please let Hannah or me know and we can actually have a CMC.

Otherwise, please file a joint proposed scheduling order based on the latest OGP (version 3.2) using the following dates:

1. CMC: Deemed to have occurred on 12/18/20
2. Markman: 06/04/21 at 9AM (full-day)
3. Estimated trial date: 06/06/22

To the extent that the parties would like to move the trial date (to an earlier or later date), please feel free to raise that at the Markman hearing.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

-Josh

Joshua J. Yi, Ph.D.

Law Clerk to the Honorable Alan D Albright
United States District Court
Western District of Texas
joshua_yi@txwd.uscourts.gov
254-750-1518

NOTICE TO RECIPIENT | This e-mail is meant for only the intended recipient of the transmission, and may be a communication privileged by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately of the error by return e-mail and please delete this message from your system. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

For more information about Orrick, please visit <http://www.orrick.com>.

In the course of our business relationship, we may collect, store and transfer information about you. Please see our privacy policy at <https://www.orrick.com/Privacy-Policy> to learn about how we use this information.